

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
8 AT SEATTLE

9 RUPFF A. HEINRICH,

10 Petitioner,

11 v.

12 WILLIAM PENALOZA, et al.,

13 Respondents.

14 Case No. C17-862-RAJ-JPD

15 REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

16 In this 28 U.S.C. § 2241 immigration habeas action, petitioner challenges his detention
17 by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”). The Government has filed a combined
18 motion to dismiss and motion to consolidate this action with *Rupff Heinz v. Immigration and*
Customs Enforcement, et al., No. C17-761-RAJ-MAT (W.D. Wash.).¹ Dkt. 10. Petitioner did
not oppose the motion.

19 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a) permits consolidation of “actions involving a
20 common question of law or fact.” “To determine whether to consolidate, a court weighs the
21 interest in judicial convenience against the potential for delay, confusion, and prejudice caused
22 by consolidation.” *Paxonet Comm’ns, Inc. v. TransSwitch Corp.*, 303 F. Supp. 2d 1027, 1028

23
1 ¹ Petitioner initiated the two actions under different names, but he used the same A-Number.

(N.D. Cal. 2003). “Consolidation is within the broad discretion of the district court.” *In re Adams Apple, Inc.*, 829 F.2d 1484, 1487 (9th Cir. 1987). Here, the C17-761-RAJ-MAT and C17-862-RAJ-JPD actions involve common questions of law and fact. In both suits, petitioner challenges his detention by ICE and seeks release. Because the Court will have to address the same factual and legal questions in both cases, judicial efficiency will be served by consolidating these actions. Accordingly, the Court recommends that the Government’s motion to consolidate, Dkt. 10, be GRANTED that that this action be consolidated with Case No. C17-761-RAJ-MAT. The Court further recommends that ruling on the Government’s motion to dismiss be RESERVED until the cases are consolidated. A proposed order accompanies this Report and Recommendation.

11 Objections to this Report and Recommendation, if any, should be filed with the Clerk and
12 served upon all parties to this suit by no later than **September 12, 2017**. Failure to file
13 objections within the specified time may affect your right to appeal. Objections should be noted
14 for consideration on the District Judge's motion calendar for the third Friday after they are filed.
15 Responses to objections may be filed within **fourteen (14)** days after service of objections. If no
16 timely objections are filed, the matter will be ready for consideration by the District Judge on
17 **September 15, 2017**.

18 This Report and Recommendation is not an appealable order. Thus, a notice of appeal
19 seeking review in the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit should not be filed until the
20 assigned District Judge acts on this Report and Recommendation.

21 Dated this 22nd day of August, 2017.

James P. Donohue

JAMES P. DONOHUE
Chief United States Magistrate Judge